II.   REMARKS

A.   Status

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are pending of which claims 1, 7, 13, and 16 are independent.

In the Office Action, the previous rejection of claims 1-14 as being anticipated by Sato is withdrawn. Office Action at 2. Claims 1, 7, 13, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Baumgartner et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0022115, hereinafter "Baumgartner"). *Id.* at 2-3. Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Baumgartner. *Id.* at 4-6.

In this amendment, no claims were amended or cancelled. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

B.   Claims Are Not Anticipated

Claims 1, 7, 13, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Baumgartner. Office Action at 2-3. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 7 and 13 are characterized by a static conversion of a schema from the first into the second before applying the second schema to a structured document to be inspected. For example, claim 1 recites in the preamble: "a first document structure definition… for the purpose of effecting *conversion* to generate a second document structure definition." Amendment at 2. Baumgartner does not teach such a method.

Baumgartner discloses a method and system for interactively and visually constructing information patterns of interest to be used for extracting information from web pages.

Baumgartner at Abstract. Each pattern is defined via the interactive specification of one or more filters. *Id.*

The rejection relies on the assumption that Baumgartner's HTML document as equivalent to the structured document in the present invention; the cited filter to our document structure definition; and the cited "modifying of filters" to our "applying of a document structure alteration rule". Office Action at 2-3. It alleged that the present invention is anticipated by Baumgartner because his process that a first filter is converted into a second filter through the interactive modifying of the first filter before applying the patterns defined by the second filter to the HTML document is similar to the present invention of claim 1 if extracting desired elements from the HTML document based on the defined patterns is regarded as a process of inspecting the structured document based on the first or the second document structure definition in the present invention. *Id.*

Baumgartner relies upon the interactive specification of filters to choose and modify the desired filters or patterns, not using the alteration rules of claim 1. The present invention as recited in claim 1 makes it possible to automatically change the document structure definition by using the alteration rules. Amendment at 2. In contrast, Baumgartner's selection and modifying of the desired filters have to depend on human intervention so that it is difficult for Baumgartner to use the selection rules or alteration rules instead of the manual handling of the filters. Baumgartner's extraction of the desired elements from the HTML document is human-dependent, a process quite different from the process of inspecting a structured document based on the alteration rules automatically executed without human intervention, as recited in claim 1.

Once the alteration rules have been established in the present invention of claim 1, the rules are able to be applied repeatedly to many schemas without change, while Baumgartner's

modifying operation of filters have to be tried for each user repeatedly until desirable filters or patterns are found. Because Baumgartner's method lacks modifying standard available over a number of users, there is a great difference in processing efficiency between Baumgartner and the invention of claim 1.

Further, if Baumgartner's filter is a schema as alleged by the Examiner, it does not use it directly to extract desired elements from the HTML document but uses pattern instances instead, unlike the invention recited in claim 1 that uses one or more document structure definition as schemas to inspect a structured document. Amendment at 2. Baumgartner's wrapper (information extractor) resembles an information retrieval processor using a set of specific keywords rather than an inspection of a structured document as in claim 1.

Independent claims 7 and 13 contain limitations similar to those found in claim 1. For instance, claim 7 recites, "...a first document structure definition. For the purpose of effecting *conversion* to generate a second document structure definition." Amendment at 4 (emphasis added). Further, the limitation relating to the independent rule of claim 7 is the same as the one found in claim 1. *Id.* at 4. Claim 13 recites a computer program with similar limitations. *Id.* at 5-6. Hence, independent claims 7 and 13 are not anticipated by Baumgartner for reasons the same as for claim 1.

Independent claim 16 is characterized by a dynamic switching of the schema to be applied to the structured document from the first to the second when a change of structure in the structured document needs the second instead of the first during an element-by element sequential inspection of the structured document.

The invention recited by claim 16 does not alter schemas themselves, but it switches a schema to be applied from the first schema to the second when the first schema was found

inconsistent with the structure of the current structured document, after obtaining the second schema through a search of alteration rule library, to continue the inspection using the second schema. Amendment at 6-7. On the other hand, Baumgartner modifies the applicable filters when the previous filters prove undesirable through a test. Baumgartner at ¶¶ [201-209]. After those tests, the finally accomplished filters after modification are applied to extract desirable elements from the HTML document. *Id.* That is, while Baumgartner modifies a set of filters, the invention of claim 16 does not alter an applicable schema but just switches it from one to another: "conducting a second inspection...by use of a second document structure definition." Amendment at 7. Thus, Baumgartner does not teach each and every element of claim 16 and does not anticipate it.

Of course, a dependent claim cannot be anticipated if the independent claim from which it depends is not anticipated. As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 7 are not anticipated. Claims 2, 3, 4, 6, and 15 depend from claim 1 and claims 8, 9, 10, and 12 depend from independent claim 7. Therefore, the dependent claims are also not anticipated.

C.   Claims Are Not Obvious

Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Baumgartner. Office Action at 4-6. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

First, however, Applicant notes that the Office Action does not reject any of the independent claims for obviousness. Office Action at 4-6. Claims 2-4, 6, and 15 depend from independent claim 1. Amendment at 2-6. Claims 8-10 and 12 depend from independent claim 7.

Id. at 4-5. Accordingly, the dependent claims cannot be obvious if their present claims are not obvious.

Second, Baumgartner does not teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention, as discussed above. Amendment at 7-10. Thus, the single reference obviousness rejection cannot be maintained and Applicant respectfully submits that all independent claims 2-4, 6, 8-10, and 12 are in condition for allowance.

III.   CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

David A. Spenard
Registration No. 37,449

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 DAS:lcb
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 13, 2007

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**